

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

The pending claims stand rejected under §103 as unpatentable over Mitsuoka and various other references. Applicants have amended each of the independent claims to distinguish Mitsuoka and obvious variations thereof.

In applicants' system, the pass code logon for access to job offers allows implementation of a novel method that is not taught or suggested by Mitsuoka or any other reference. Mitsuoka never teaches or suggests that the job provider has access to information identifying the individual job candidates. The job providers merely specify criteria to be met and they never specify a preference for any individual or a request to exclude any individual.

In the system taught in the applicant's disclosure, the job providers are familiar with many or most of the job candidates and they have access to the name of each job candidate which they can use to get positive or negative references from others who know the candidate. The applicants' system is designed to allow the job providers to use the information that they have directly acquired or acquired by references from others to either indicate a preference for a certain individual or short list of individuals or to exclude a certain individual or short list of individuals. This is the important function served by the task code logon limitation in the pending claims. Individuals that have been excluded by the job provider are not given the vacant position information and this is implemented by allowing each candidate to see only information intended to be delivered to that candidate. Conversely, if an individual is preferred, the system will offer the job to that candidate first and, only if the candidate does not accept by a deadline, then offer the job to other candidates. For each preferred individual, the system also informs them when they view the information about the job position that they were designated as a preferred candidate.

Each of the independent claims has been amended to include either a limitation where a preferred individual candidate is designated and then notified or a limitation where undesirable individuals are designated as excluded and then excluded from the notification. Independent claims 37 and 44, which have been amended to allow specification of a preferred individual, already included such a preference limitation.

Applicants believe that the additional limitations added to claims 37 and 44 have not narrowed the scope of these claims but have merely clarified the previously stated limitations.

Although Mitsuoka teaches that the computer system might create priorities between candidates based on their qualifications, Mitsuoka does not teach that the job provider might specify a preference for certain individuals or request to exclude certain individuals based on subjective knowledge about the person.

In the event an additional fee is due for this Response, you are hereby authorized to charge such payment to Deposit Account No. 07-1897.

Respectfully submitted,

GRAYBEAL JACKSON HALEY LLP



Jeffrey T. Haley
Registration No.: 34,834
155 108th Ave. NE, Suite 350
Bellevue, WA 98004-5973
Telephone: (425) 455-5575
Facsimile: (425) 455-1046